

R E M A R K S

Claims 15-25 and 27-29 are pending in the present application; claim 26 has been cancelled.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to because the drawings contain improper sectional views. Figs. 1 and 5 have been corrected accordingly. Also, reference numerals mentioned in the specification and not included in the drawings have now been added to the drawings.

Proposed drawings Figs. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, and 10 are submitted herewith for approval. If these drawing changes are approved by the Examiner, correct formal drawings will be submitted upon allowance of claims in the application.

Objection to the Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of informalities. The deficiencies pointed out by the Examiner have been corrected with the above amendments to the specification.

Objection to the Claims

The claims are objected to because they lack a proper introduction. The Examiner refers to MPEP § 608.01(m). It is respectfully submitted that the text of the cited portion clearly states "(or the equivalent)", i.e., not only the wording "I claim", "We claim", or "The invention claimed is" are acceptable, but also equivalent phrases. It is respectfully submitted that the wording "What is claimed is" is an equivalent; see, for example, US patent 5,160,198 cited by the Examiner.

Rejection of Claims under 35 USC § 112

Claims 15-29 are rejected under 35 USC § 112, 2nd paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 15 and 27 have been amended in order to provide structural cooperative relationship between the means for preventing rotation and the stirrer can. Claim 27 has also been revised in order to overcome the other deficiencies pointed out by the Examiner.

Claims 21 and 23 have been corrected in view of the Examiner's remarks.

Claim Rejection under 35 USC § 102

Claim 25 stands rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Marienthal* or *Stockton* or *Worden*.

Claim 25 has been amended by incorporating therein the subject matter of claim 26 and should thus be allowable.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 15-24 and 27-29 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 USC § 112. Claim 26 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 USC § 112 and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim.

The claims 15-25 and 27-29 have been amended where necessary, and it is believed that the claims in their amended form have overcome the rejection under § 112.


Conclusion

Applicant herewith respectfully requests reconsideration in the light of the above amendments and arguments, and solicits the allowability of the claims 15-25 and 27-29.

Applicant has attempted to respond fully to the outstanding Office Action. However, should the Examiner have any further questions or comments, the undersigned would welcome a telephone call in order to bring the application into condition for allowance.

It is respectfully requested that, if necessary to effect a timely response, this paper be considered as a Petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response and any fees required or any shortages in any fees be charged to Deposit Account 02-1653.

Respectfully submitted,


Ms. Gudrun E. Huckett, Reg. No.
35,747, for the Applicant

Robert W. Becker & Associates
11896 N. Highway 14, Suite B
Tijeras, NM 87059


Telephone: (505) 286-3511
Telefax: (505) 286-3524

-/GEH

Enclosure - Letter to Draftsman and drawing proposals (3 sheets)


DRAWING PROPOSAL

Fig. 1



DRAWING PROPOSAL

Fig. 10



DRAWING PROPOSAL

Fig. 4




Fig. 5




Fig. 6




Fig. 7




Fig. 8






Fig. 9



DRAWING PROPOSAL

Fig. 2



DRAWING PROPOSAL

Fig. 3

